

Appln No. 10/760,210
Amdt. Dated July 14, 2006
Response to Office Action of May 23, 2006

2

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Examiner's final Office Action of May 23, 2006 the Applicant respectfully submits the following Remarks.

Regarding 35 USC 102(b) Rejections

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of pending independent claim 1, and claims 2-4 and 6 dependent therefrom, is not disclosed by previously cited Silverbrook, for at least the following reasons.

In the final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the printhead module 12 of Silverbrook corresponds to the first portion of the claimed invention and the chassis 14 of Silverbrook corresponds to the second portion of the claimed invention, and further asserts that "the first portion includes the pagewidth printhead (18's of Fig 2 and Fig 8)" and that the "two portions are detachable from each other in a single clipping operation".

However, Silverbrook clearly discloses at col. 2, lines 9-10 that "Each printhead module 12 is comprised of a microelectromechanical (Memjet) chip 18", at col. 2, lines 22-25 that "Ten modules 12 butt together into the reservoir 16 to form a complete 8 inch printhead assembly 10", and at col. 5, lines 39-42 that "Slots 97 are defined in the chassis 14 for enabling access to be gained to the clips 44 of the modules 12 to release the modules 12 from the ink reservoir 16 for enabling replacement of one or more of the modules 12".

Thus, it is clear that a plurality of the printhead modules 12 are required to form a pagewidth printhead, and that a single operation is required to detach each individual printhead module 12 from the chassis 14. Accordingly, Silverbrook discloses an arrangement in which a plurality of operations is required to detach the plurality of the printhead modules 12 ("first portions" as asserted by the Examiner) from the chassis 14 ("second portion" as asserted by the Examiner) in order to detach all of the chips 18 ("pagewidth" printhead as asserted by the Examiner) from the chassis 14, which is contrary to the claimed invention.

Further, as argued by the Applicant in the Reply to the previous Office Action, the disclosure of Silverbrook does not teach or suggest one of ordinary skill in the art to modify

Appln No. 10/760,210
Amdt. Dated July 14, 2006
Response to Office Action of May 23, 2006

3

the disclosed assembly, because Silverbrook specifically teaches that the modularity is provided by the clipping in of the individual modules into the reservoir molding.

Thus, the subject matter of amended independent claim 1, and claims 2-7 dependent therefrom, is not disclosed or suggested by Silverbrook.

Regarding 35 USC 103(a) Rejections

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of dependent claims 5 and 7 are not taught or suggested by Silverbrook in view of Waller et al. (US 6,250,738), for at least the reasons discussed above and in the Applicant's Reply to the previous Office Action.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762